

**Written Comments Planning Commission  
August 10, 2010**

**Glenn School Commercial (Z0900019)**

**Ms. Beechwood.** I voted to deny the zoning change.

The site is well situated for the requested commercial zoning, and many of the uses that the applicant suggested (gas station, restaurant) seemed very appropriate. However, the development plan was exceptionally vague. The applicant was unable to elicit confidence in his plan for this site from the commissioners. It was suggested that the applicant return with the rezoning request when he had a clearer idea of the type and scope of the development he proposed.

**Mr. Brine.** I voted against recommending approval in spite of a proffered conceptual committed element regarding uses on the site. Although the site location seems suitable for the CG district, the vagueness of the applicant's proposal left questions about how the site would be developed and whether or not development would be sensitive to the environment. Some specific points follow:

1) The proposed building floor area is inconsistent with the proposed impervious surface (page 2 of staff report). A building floor area of 33,500 square feet should not require over 250,400 square feet of parking, which is what the 70% impervious surface implies. Based on the applicant's statement that, in commercial developments, about 25% of the impervious surface comes from building floor area (that is, footprints), the 70% impervious surface in this proposal could mean that the building floor area would eventually be 70,980 square feet. Should this be the case, the proposed transportation infrastructure improvements are not sufficient, as they appear to be based on the lower building square footage. (Due to the new shopping center across I-85, there is some concern as to whether or not the proposed improvements are adequate.)

2) Staff states (page 9) that the proposal is consistent with Comprehensive Plan policy 9.4.1b (now somewhat outdated) concerning nutrient export levels in the Neuse basin. There is not a shred of evidence to support this consistency. The newer standards are going to be tough to meet. Durham citizens are on the hook for millions of dollars to clean up Jordan and Falls Lakes. Consequently, saying that an applicant is consistent with the LOS standard without any supporting evidence seems irresponsible to me. I believe that, at a minimum, the applicant needs to provide information about how he would meet the standards so that the County stormwater personnel could review it and provide feedback to the Commission and the Governing Body. That process would increase my level of comfort.

3) There are a number of large trees on the site. Hopefully, many of them can be saved when the site is developed. However, unless they are in a tree save area, there is no commitment to do this.

**Ms. Brown.** The applicant in my opinion is asking for a blank check on development.

The Planning commission had no idea what would be developed on this property ,nor did the applicant.

Applicant stated to me, they just wanted the property rezoned for " a sometime down the road project".

The property could set for awhile and then be flipped.

I agree that this property should be commercial. But with the very vague information provided, it is impossible to know what will be on this site years from now.

This site is almost completely wooded. There are HUGE trees scattered around the site.

The site is rural in character. A church is 3 lots down from the site, agriculture lands, single family home on large lots and Glenn School is about four tenth of a mile from the site. Across the street from this site is a bar.

A 54 acre Wal-Mart site opened up one year ago, just down from this site. Out parcels at the Wal-Mart site still remain empty.

Traffic congestion in the area has increase to the point that, I believe the infrastructure is now inadequate to support the current stores in the area. This area has been identified by DOT to construct the Northern Durham Parkway. The Parkway has no funding and probably want for many years to come.

Glenn School Rd/I 85 bridge is one of the two bridges in this area of I-85 that has not been upgraded.

Heavy trucks cross this bridge everyday to take their supply's to the Glenn Rd. strip mall.

Glenn Elementary School buses have to take this route to pick up our children in the area.

Glenn School Rd. is a narrow (country road) with a curve in it. It dead ends at a stop sign at Glenn Rd.

When you receive this request, please visit this site and go up into site, to see the beauty of trees in Durham, when you exit the site go to the left and see the dangers of the narrow Glenn school Rd.

Oh, and don't forget to visit our local Wal-Mart area, that was supposed to be a Super Target before it was flipped.

I voted to deny, because I think this request is not in the neighborhoods best interest and I also believe that there is no justification for why, we should sign blank checks.

**Ms. Jacobs.** While commercial general is the use that makes sense for this property with its proximity to the Glen School Road access to I-85, I cannot support this rezoning due to the lack of information in the development plan and many unanswered questions and concerns about traffic impact and environmental impact. While the applicant did commit to limit some uses, with the proposed development to limit some uses, with the proposed development plan we do not know anything else about how this sire will be developed and its impact on existing residences and adjacent church. The proposed 70% impervious seems excessive for 35,000 sf. Of commercial and there are concerns about existing traffic problems on Glenn School Road from the nearby Wal-Mart development and issues of the property owner not cleaning up and maintaining adjacent owned property.

**Mr. Kimball.** I voted to approve with the committed elements of excluding CG uses of indoor shooting range & bar or nightclub. In addition to the staff presented and developer agreed commitments.

**Mr. Martin.** No, Concern about traffic and impact on environment.

**Ms. Mitchell-Allen.** I voted to deny.

**Mr. Monds.** I voted against the motion. I have concerns about traffic capacity and the uncertainty on the actual development.

**Mr. Whitley.** I voted not to approve. Glenn School Road needs to be three to four lanes.

**Ms. Winders.** I voted against approval of the rezoning. Though a change to a commercial use at some time in the future is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, now is not the appropriate time.

Reasons:

1) Problems of traffic congestion and inadequate transportation infrastructure: The bridge over I-85 and the access lanes are inadequate and in poor condition. Traffic generated by a nearby WalMart creates congestion in the area.

2) Other: a) Applicants do not have immediate plans for development, but are seeking rezoning so that they will be ready when the economy turns around. There is no benefit to the community to rezone now, and development plan is too vague. b) Owner has not been responsible in the management of adjacent property. They demolished a building without getting a permit and left an unsafe pile of debris. Approving rezoning with only a vague idea of what may be built is risky.

**Mr. Womack.** I voted denial. Problems with transportation, bridge size and the general desertions to impervious surface, square foot of buildings, old growth trees, and storm water disposal.